Agency Information

AGENCY: SSCIA

RECORD NUMBER: 157-10002-10179

RECORD SERIES: TRANSCRIPT

AGENCY FILE NUMBER : R-3053

Document Information

ORIGINATOR: SSCIA

FROM:

TO:

TITLE: COMMITTEE BUSINESS RE: RELEASE OF CHURCH COMMITTEE REPORT ON ASSASS.

DATE: 05/26/1976-

PAGES: 40

SUBJECTS:

KENNEDY

ASSASSINATION

AMLASH-

CHURCH COMMITTEE REPORT

OPERATION MONGOOSE

DOCUMENT TYPE: PAPER, TEXTUAL DOCUMENT

CLASSIFICATION: Top Secret

RESTRICTIONS: Consulted

CURRENT STATUS: WHITHOID OFFN

DATE OF LAST REVIEW: 09/30/1993

OPENING CRITERIA:

COMMENTS: Box 325Folder 1.1

ORIGINAL

Vol. 1 OF 3

NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION

Unauthorized Disclosure Subject to Criminal Sanctions

Released under the John F. Kennedy

Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992 (44 USC 2107 Note). Case#:NW 54545 Date:

10-12-2017

The United States Senate

R3053

Report of Proceedings

Hearing held before

Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental
Operations With Respect to Intelligence Activities

Wednesday, May 26, 1976

Washington, D. C.

(Stenotype Tape and Waste turned over to the Committee for destruction)

WARD & PAUL

3017 WILSON BOULEVARD ARLINGTON, VA 22201

(703) 841-0800

TOP STORET

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Wednesday, hay 26,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

74 15

.16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

United States Senate,

Select Committee to Study Governmental

Operations with Respect to

Intelligence Activities,

Washington, D.C.

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:43 o'clock a.m., in Room S-407, the Capitol, the Honorable John Tower (Vice Chairman of the Committee) gresiding.

Present: Senators Tower (presiding), Hart of Michigan, Mondale, Buddleston, Hart of Colorado, Mathias, and Schweiker.

Also present: Senator Inouye.

Staff: William G. Miller, Staff Director; Charles Kirbow, Jim Johnston, Britt Snider, Paul Wallach, Michael Epstein, Rick Inderfurth, David Aaron, Ed Greissing, Dan Dwyer, Elliot Maxwell, Michael Madigan, Charles Lombard, Bob Kelley and John Bayly, Professional Staff Members.

Phone (Area 202) 544-6000

410 First Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003

24.

IUP DECKE

PROCEEDINGS

Senator Tower. Let's go ahead and start. The Committee will come to order.

The first thing I want to do is welcome Senator Inouye to the Committee. He is the Chairman desginate of the Committee to succeed this one as the oversight Committee, and we have invited him to come view the stellar example that we can set for him for his Committee and its work.

Senator Inouye. I am learning.

Senator Tower. The first thing you have to do is get a quorum, and that is the most difficult job, and I would like to ask, Dan, if you have any questions.

The first item on the agenda is the consideration of requests from Senator Abourezk in his capacity as Chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee for certain files.

Bill, would you enlighten us on that?

Mr. Miller. Yes.

During the course of the investigation, the Committee acquired a file of documents from outside sources, that is, outside the Executive Branch, on the American Indian Movement, with particular reference to events at Wounded Knee. Among the documents is one FBI document. All of the others are documents which are not Executive Branch documents.

I have looked through them. I don't think they are sensitive in a security fashion. I think they are of relevance

ILIP DECKE

to Senator Abourezk's Committee. We have asked the Bureau to clear the one document which seems to come from the FBI, and I would recommend that the Committee authorize the turnover of that file to Senator Abourezk for such use as he may wish.

Senator Tower. The Chair is prepared to entertain a motion to the effect that the files should be turned over to Senator Abourezk with the exception of the one document that comes from the Bureau, contingent -- including that document, contingent on its declassification by Justice.

Senator Mondale. So moved.

Senator Tower. Is there any objection?
So ordered.

The next item on the agenda is the consideration of the assassination report.

Senator Hart, are you going to take the lead-off on this?

Senator Hart of Colorado. I would prefer that either Dick or the staff talk. I think what we are going to request here is a final decision by the Committee, or at least a majority of the Committee, on disposition of this. My own feeling -- well, I will reserve that, but Dick may want to say something, or the staff.

Senator Tower. Senator Schweiker?
Senator Schweiker. Thank you.

First I want to congratulate our new Chairman on his work.

I don't know if he fully knows what he is getting into, but we

.3

wish you our best and good luck in your new assignment.

And second, I want to say that the report, I guess everybody now has a copy of the report, has been revised substantially in terms of format and approach, and I think it zeroes in completely on what the original request of Senators Church and Tower were, which was to look into the performance relationship of the intelligence agencies to the Kennedy assassination and the Warren Commission. I think the earlier report frankly strayed a little bit from that goal, but we I think have pinned it down very specifically, and I think we have substantiated the statement of the conclusions in the summary that we made.

I would like to recommend — I realize you cannot read the whole report, but I think you can certainly get the complete gist of what we are saying in the summary and in the conclusions by reading those two things you pretty well come down on what we are saying and doing, and in view of the time factor, a suggestion I would like to make is that if people take time to read the summaries and conclusions, which we can do in a matter of five minutes at some point, and basically feel satisfied as to the thrust of it, that we then vote on the release of the report under this condition, that we vote to publicly release the report and then, since there are obviously, want to get which we would concur with that we would ask the staff to do that and let Senator Hart and I work cut any sources and methods

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

problems, detail problems, where they might contradict some information we have here in terms of just following it up.

I do think it is a very good job. I think it is a very credible work, and I think that by taking this phase and publicly releasing it now, after we have cleared the CTA and the FBI problems, it will give Danny Inouye's Committee a free hand. In other words, all we made is a recommendation: If we don't publish a report now, you immediately get a real problem in your Committee, as I see, as to what you do with what we have done. If we publish now, I think you are a lot freer to decide, having us made a judgment on the CIA and FBI responsibility, whether you want to pursue or not pursue. obviously recommend that you pursue, but I think if we don't publish that, I think that would be a bad mistake, because we would be accused of a coverup. We would also immediately put a hot potato in your new Committee which you would be hung with, and I think it gives you a lot more freedom to treat at arm's length our recommendations if we publish now in terms of the FBI and the CIA relationships.

Think that there is some embarrassment here to both the CTA and the FBT. I don't think we should kid ourselves about that. We don't find out who done it, and we don't contradict the basic finding of the Warren Commission, but we certainly criticize the process and substantially document why that criticism is valid, and I think just the same as our original

1.5

assassination report, our study of the IRS or other things,
I think this would fall into that kind of categorical treatment.

That, I guess, is my situation in a nutshell.

Senator Tower. Do you want to have the staff summarize this. Dick?

Senator Schweiker. That probably would be well.

Senator Tower. Why don't you call on whoever you choose to kick it off?

Senator Schweiker. All right. We did try to be very even handed, as I say. Neither the CIA or the FBI is going to like what we say. On the other hand, I don't think we singled out one agency in either respect, so Paul, how do you want to divide up the brief report?

Mr. Wallach. I think I can begin just by putting the report in perspective, but I think that if we take a step back and I am going to ask Jim just to really detail just quickly again, succinctly the period from 1960 through November 22nd, 1963, the day of the assassination, just very generally what the agencies were doing at that time period, and I will come back and tie in what the FBI was doing with Oswald during that time period, which is one section of our report.

And then the next section of our report really goes to how the agencies reacted in one of the most critical time periods, and I think that you will see that there was an intelligence railure of sorts, both before and after the assassination.

1.6

W BEEKE

The intelligence failure before I don't want to say was of a nature that would have prevented the assassination, and there is no such statement in the report to that effect. In fact, the suggestion is not really even there. What you do see are many problems inherent in the structure as it now exists between the FEI and the CIA, problems that came up during the investigation where there were questions as to who had jurisdiction to investigate what, and many areas fell between the cracks. You have the problem of covert actions that our Committee has looked into. Here may have been a covert action that was so covert that no one could tell the investigators about it, and it backfired, in a sense, on some of the highest officials in the country. And many other problems I think that our Committee has dealt with come out so clearly on the study that we have made on the assassination report.

I just would ask Jim to very briefly just make a couple of statements about that period so you can get a feel as to what really -- I know the Committee has a good feel as to what we were doing vis-a-vis Cuba, but I don't think it has the same feel as to what was happening with the anti-Castro exile groups in this country in the context of Lee Harvey Oswald.

Mr. Johnston. Let me start out with we tried to put ourselves back in the position of the Warren Commission, with the Chief Justice of the United States who was not familiar with the intelligence agencies and now he approached the problem

. 3

of the assassination, and what comes out is it does not look
like the Warren Commission fully understood the whole program
the United States Government had been running against Cuba for
three years.

They knew about the Bay of Pigs, they fully understood that

It is unclear if they knew about how that evolved into a

MONGOOSE operation, which was the use of Cuban exiles to accomplish
the same end, and how apparently, after the missile crisis of

October 1962, Government policy again changed to a clamp-down
on Cuban exiles, the very group that the Government had been

supporting for two years.

United States Government was raiding, seizing arms of the Cuban exile groups on the one hand, and on the other hand, using the CIA to accomplish the same ends by having CIA agents make those raids against Cuba. And it ultimately evolved into the AMLASH operation, which is an operation apparently designed to bring about a coup in Cuba with AMLASH himself proposing that they do that by assassination of Castro.

And especially after June of 1963, things became very muddled. The Cuban exile groups got very irked at the Kennedy administration's decision to clamp down on them. They were in turn meeting in attempts to have unity, efforts to bring about their own invasion or operations against Cuba, but the Kennedy administration was trying to put the clamps on them.

1

2

3

6 7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

.16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

The CIA has escalated by its own coup planning.

The report then focuses principally on how AMLASH figured into this scheme. Castro in early September warned against U.S. leaders who were meeting with terrorist in Cuba, and that he would threaten retalistion against U. S. leaders, and the coincidence of that warning coming two days after the original meetings with AMLASE.

Subsequent to that, five days after Castro's warning, we have determined that the Cuban, one of the interagency committees on Cuba --

Senator Schweiker. I think this is one of the most important points of all that has just come to light. So go ahead, Jim, I just wanted to call their attention to it.

Mr. Johnston. One of the interagency committees dealing with Cuba on September 12th, which is five days after Castro's warning, had a meeting to evaluate their contingency plans about Cuban retaliation. We have had access to the memorandum of General Haid who was attending that meeting, and in that memoran dum, according to General Haig, what went on at the meeting was they said, look, the rash of covert activity that is now going on against Cuba may lead to some kind of retaliation, so let us look at our contingency plans to prepare ourselves for retaliation.

They decided at that meeting that any retaliation by Castro would be at a low level, and that he would not risk confrontation

Washington, D.C. First Street, S.E.,

2

.5

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

77

12

13

74

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE RESTAURANT OF THE PARTY OF

against the United States, although he had in the September 7th speech warned against a major confrontation worse than the missile crisis.

The CIA people attending that meeting came from the Cuban Affairs Staff, the various staff who probably -- we don't know the names of the people who attended, but in all likelihood, the very people who were working on the AMLASH operation. At the meeting on September 12th, this interagency Committee rejected the possibility of an assassination of a U.S. leader in the United States.

Senator Schweiker. Do we know, Jim, whether the people from SAS told that meeting about AMLASH? Were the people all aware of AMLASH at that meeting?

Mr. Johnston. There is no indication that they were. All we have to rely on is the memorandum. There is no mention of that, any mention in that memorandum the possibility of retaliation by assassination of a U.S. leader as an unlikely possibility.

Senator Matrias. Was there any evidence that General Haig had ever been further questioned about that?

Mr. Johnston. No, sir.

Subsequent to that meeting, on the 12th of September, they continued their contingency plan, and they had eliminated the possibility that Castro would retaliate by an assassination against a leader in the United States. They did program into

their consideration the possibility that he would assassinate
U.S. leaders in Latin America, U.S. officials in Latin America.

At the end of September, coming out of this whole review, they warned, or they told the Justice Department representatives to warn the FBI that Castro might conduct a sabotage operation, but basically the thrust coming out of that meeting is the FBI was not told that they had considered and rejected an assassiation of a U.S. leader within this country.

And again, we know little about the group's planning. We do know that events in the AMLASH operation on September 12th would indicate that they were not fully at that point decided on the fact that they would use AMLASH to assassinate Castro, or that they would even give him that assurance.

In any event, they did later give that assurance to AMLASH after these series of meetings of the interagency committee were over, and on October 29th, 1963, Desmond Fitzgerald, who was head of the Cuban Affairs Staff, actually met with AMLASH in Paris, and the significance of that is, at least to our thinking, was that it destroyed plausible deniability for such a senior official of the CIA to actually meet with an agent:

Senator Schweiker. Who wanted to assassinate Castro.

Mr. Johnston. Who wanted to assassinate Castro, and who told that agent that the United States Government, not the Mafia or anybody else, but actually told him that the United States Government was behind his proposals, would have given

assurances to that agent that this government was going to conduct or was considering conducting an assassination operation.

Senator Tower. That was rather extraordinary conduct, wasn't it, for a senior official to meet with an agent?

Mr. Johnston. We believe so. He was warned not to do it.

Senator Schweiker. Several people warned him not to do that, John. We have records of that. So he went against sort of in-house policy.

Mr. Wallach. He also stated, I believe, that he was a personal representative speaking for the Attorney General.

Mr. Epstein. One of the reasons they had been expressing advice that they not have that kind of a meeting, because they were concerned about whether the project was security, the security, of course, involving the question of whether or not AMLASH might be a double agent and might not be trustworthy, and whether the information might get back to Castro, which later bears a relationship to whether or not that threat that Castro made was based on real knowledge or not.

Mr. Johnston. At this point in the chronology, before the Firzgerald meeting on October 29th, the FBI learned through a source it had --

Senator Schweiker. And this is another very important point because it shows some kind of action parallel to the CIA.

Mr. Johnston. -- that AMLASH was meeting with CIA.

.2

1.5

Senator Schweiker. And the FBI, it's own, the FBI told us.

Mr. Johnston. AMLASH had the reputation of being a pretty flightly character, and had during the revolution against Batista once shot somebody or killed a man in a bar, and that was indeed his attractiveness, was that he was probably fairly well known as someone who was capable of assassination. So the knowledge outside of the CIA of the fact that AMLASH was meeting with the CIA could lead many people to believe that the CIA was using him in an assassination plot, even though there is no indication in the FBI report that the source knew of the nature of the CIA-AMLASH meetings. The point is that in early October, the CIA operation using AMLASH was compromised, and it appears that the Cuban exiles, anti-Castro Cuban exiles could have had knowledge the CIA was engaged in this plot.

This goes ultimately to motivation of other groups to use an assassination attempt against Kennedy for their own purposes.

In any event, planning with AMLASH continued until ultimately, two days before the President's assassination, he was told that there would be a meeting on November 22nd, and that it was not the meeting — he didn't know whether the meeting would be satisfactory to AMLASH, but it was the meeting that AMLASH had requested, and so actually that meeting was set up ahead of time, and if AMLASH were a double agent, or

8.

somebody else in the operation a double agent, there would have been advance knowledge of the November 22nd meeting.

Then after the assassination of President Kennedy, in fact, at the very moment CIA had fashioned a poison pen, a Papermate pen, and had passed that or offered it to AMLASH at this meeting, and had also assured AMLASH that the President was fully behind the coup attempt and fully behind AMLASH. He also offered or told AMLASH that rifles with telescopic sights would be dropped in Cuba for his use, again, the thrust being a great motivation on November 22nd, a great motivation within CIA to be very concerned about this operation and to be very concerned about its own reputation, and possibly concerned within the government circles as to the whole Cuban area.

We then followed the trail on AMLASH and later on through history, and found, first of all, on November 24th, that there appears to -- CIA investigators on the assassination requested AMLASH's file, and apparently did not get that file, or at least if they got it, did not get any operational materials, so that those people who were investigating the President's assassination were denied at that point knowledge of the AMLASH operation.

In fact, those investigators have told us that they never knew in that timeframe about any assassination operation, and when we described to them the scenario I have just described to you, they said that that would have been a vital factor in their investigation. It goes again, to not whether Castro did it, but

.1

.23

as to the whole shaping of the assassination investigation.

Senator Hart of Colorado. As to whether Oswald did it.

Mr. Johnston. Castro did it through Oswald.

Senator Schweiker. I think that is probably the most significant CIA testimony we have. We talked to the chief investigator for CIA, a very responsive, very straightforward guy, and he had absolutely no knowledge when he as asked by Helms to conduct this investigation of AMLASH or any attempts against Castro's life, was never told that during his whole conducting of the investigation, and admitted to us it would have changed the whole direction and thrust of what he had been doing if he had known that.

So it was deliberately withheld from him.

And the parallel to that, which I am sure that Paul is going to get to, is you go to the Criminal Investigation of the FBI and the exact parallel appears there. The chief guys in the FBI charged with the investigation were denied access, were not told of things we now know Hoover and the top leadership did know about AMLASH and the other investigation.

So the two top investigators in both bodies were withheld the vital facts of the Castro thing. And I don't particularly, necessarily see it come down on the Castro side, because if you know about the Castro thing, then you also would be investigating the anti-Castro possibilities. So by denying this, they didn't look at either the pro or anti-Castro

.11

1.5

possibilities.

I am sorry, Jim, I interrupted you.

Mr. Johnston. I just wanted to make one point following up on this.

The detailed report builds the case in the two weeks after the President's assassination, the information that was coming into CTA, and much of that information is pointing to Cuba. Indeed, the hottest leads that were coming into CTA pointed to Cuba, and yet we find that by the end of December the Cuban specialists at CTA were not put directly in touch with the Warren Commission, and they were not put in touch or they were not given the responsibility for continuing the investigation, and indeed, they have testified, the counterintelligence expert on Cuban affairs, testified that he never really sat down with any of the investigators to analyze all of the facts in the Oswald case, to see whether there was any possibility of a connection with Cuba.

And so what it appears, what we have done in this report is to build the case, then, of all of the possibilities of a conspiracy on a global scale, the most likely looked to be a conspiracy somehow involving either pro or anti-Castro forces, and we do not understand why that was not fully pursued by the CIA.

And there are mammoth records out at CIA of their investigation of Soviet, possible Soviet responsibility for the

1.0

assassination, and indeed, thei	r experts on 8	Soviet affairs
were the ones who ran the CIA's	investigation	into the K enne dy
assassination. And they have e	xhausted that	area, apparently,
and have come up with nothing.	But we don't	find a comparable
effort with the Cuban experts.	•	

Senator Hart of Colorado. Keep in mind as just a footnote here, I think a number of us heard in general testimony Angleton suggest that he still is intrigued by the possibility — he never comes out and says it, but he always trolls around in those waters about Soviet connections in the assassination.

So to the degree that Angleton was involved in the investigation of the Kennedy assassination, I think he greatly colored the direction that that investigation took toward the Soviet side instead of the pro and anti-Castro or the Cuban side.

Senator Schweiker: There are two other footnotes. One is that when the first CIA chief investigator terminated his role, which was in about six or eight weeks. I guess, the main thrust of the keport had then been written, he then went and had a meeting with the Justice Department and the FBI, and he said he was astounded at the number of things that he learned at that meeting that he had been denied access to and was not given by the FBI that also would have been instrumental in the investigation. They withheld Oswald's diary and other stuff that frankly would have helped them, looking at whatever Cuban

connection there was or wasn't. So he made a very clear point of saying that for a critical six weeks, the FBI never gave him vital information that he felt was important for that period.

The other point is, and I think you have got to keep the other side in mind, too, and that is the President somewhere along the way blew the whistle on the anti-Castro Cubans. What was that timeframe, the last one? Was it --

Mr. Johnston. March 19th, 1963.

Senator Schweiker. And this is important because this is new knowledge. Not only did we raid the Lake Ponchartraine anti-Castro Cuban group, which was well known. We had a foreign country, and I don't want to mention their name, we had a foreign country and we gave them maps of where seven or eight Cuban camps were, and we encouraged them to go in and raid those camps. So we got another country to raid seven anti-Castro Cuban camps, and I think you can pretty well imagine the fury and the wrath and the vengeance on the anti-Castro side at that particular point in time.

But nobody checked that out. I mean, that's the point.

I mean, here are two tremendous motivation factors.

Mr. Epstein. Those are the same camps that at one time had been helping our government.

Senator Schweiker. And we were working closely with these people. So we really turned our back on our brothers, so to speak. I mean, I am sure they felt betrayed, and we got another

.1

. 20

country to do it for us.

Senator Hart of Colorado. Pursuant to the policy reached between President Kennedy and Khruschev, Khruschev pulls the missiles out of Cuba, and Kennedy agrees that we will halt our activities to overthrow Castro. That was the arrangement.

Well, that became crystal clear to all of those people, as Jim has said, that we had been supporting for two years or more in their efforts to overthrow Castro, but we just overnight as part of the missile crisis, the government changed its policy toward Cuba in that respect 180 degrees.

tendency that we can get bogged down in the facts and the details of the case. I think at the last meeting in the beginning of our summary, I sort of plagiarized and stole a quote from Senator Mondale, and I will read it, where he said nothing was more crucial to this country than to determine the facts of the assassination of President Kennedy. No one single event has shaken the country more, yet it appears from the evidence the Committee has developed that both the CIA and the FBI failed in certain of their responsibilities and for different reasons avoided others in this matter.

Now, insofar generally as the assassination investigation went on both sides, the FBI and the CTA, it appears that at every turn, when they could have looked into Cuban involvement, they did not. Often it fell between the gracks. CIA people

]

.5·

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have told us that it was the FBI's jurisdiction to look into it. We have seen FBI memoranda which said it was CIA's jurisdiction.

Senator Schweiker. And the Cuban section of FBI said the Criminal Section never asked us.

Mr. Wallach. At both agencies, it would appear that none of the Cuban experts were ever allowed to get into the investigation. The station chief at JMWAVE, which was the station down in Florida that had the operational assets inside Cuba, that possibly could have answered some questions, told us he was never directed to do anything, and he didn't believe it was in the CIA's jurisdiction to do so, to tap those assets inside Cuba.

But more than that, both agencies are trying to tell us that they had no reason to believe that there was any Cuban involvement in the assassination, whereas we have recently found documents that tell us about this interdepartmental committee on retaliation and we know that they were considering that very possibility.

We have Mr. Helms and Mr. Fitzgerald who knew about the AMIASH plot and about the earlier assassination plots, kept this information from their investigators. Hoover kept the same information from his investigators.

Additionally, the FBI had some other motivations, and we have all heard the phrase "don't embarrass the Bureau." The

1.2

FBI had a pre-assassination case on Lee Harvey Oswald. They opened it when he defected to the Soviet Union, and they interviewed him twice when he came back to this country. On both of those occasions he lied repeatedly to the agent who was interviewing him.

- Senator Schweiker. And the agent knew he lied.

Mr. Wallach. And the agent knew he lied because he had the State Department reports in his hands. The agent asked him to take a polygraph test as to his responses, as to ties with Soviet intelligence. The Warren Commission was not informed he was requested that he take a polygraph. Oswald refused.

Despite that fact, and despite the fact that the FBI supervisor said that the case on Lee Oswald could be followed in conjunction with the case on Marina, the Oswald case was closed immediately after both of those interviews.

Now, while the Committee has documented all of the methods that the FBI used in those days to gather information on someone. I don't want to come down and say that they were proper or improper. I make no judgment on that.

I just want to say that they were used on security cases. None of those were used here.

Subsequently, the case on Oswald, about six months later, was reopened again, after he subscribed to the Worker, which in Bureau parlance, is an East Coast Communist newspaper, which was directly contradictory to his statements that he made to the

agent, that he had no Communist leanings since he had returned. He then began his Fair Play for Cuba Committee work, and was in fact arrested in New Orleans in August, and asked to see an FBI agent, and again lied repeatedly to this FBI agent. In fact he told the FBI agent that he met and married his wife in Texas instead of the Soviet Union.

Then we have Oswald disappearing, going down to Mexico City.

Senator Schweiker. He told the agent that he married her in Texas?

Mr. Wallach. Yes, Senator.

Senator Schweiker. Yes, they had the files on it.

Senator Tower. Hell, Oswald wrote me in early 1962 to help expedite and exit visa for his wife. Why in the world would he tell a plopper like that?

Mr. Wallach. In any event, he told what the agent knew was lies, and what I am trying to get at is there was no analysis within the Bureau of any of this. He even goes down to Mexico City, contacts the Cuban consulate and the Soviet embassy, happens to be in contact -- we don't know if there is anything sinister about it -- with an agent who is known to be KSB by the FBI and by the CIA, and suspected of being Department 13, which is their assassination and sabotage squad.

In any event, he then returns to the United States, is never

again interviewed by the FBI, because of some, as has been described to us by the agent in Dallas, and I clearly don't want to put any blame on this agent --

Senator Schweiker. Even though they have a record that he was interviewed by a Department 13 officer, they have a record that he had an interview with a Department 13, assassination, KGB guy, and they never talked to Oswald after that.

Mr. Wallach. What I really wanted to come down on was the fact that with all of these facts in hand, on the day of the assassination, one of Mr. Hoover's first responses was to direct his chief inspector, Inspector Gale, who was Assistant Director of the FBI, to conduct an investigation of the Bureau's handling of the Oswald case before the assassination:

Six days later Gale came down with I think it is an 18 page report citing numerous what he called, and I quote, serious investigative deficiencies in the FBI's handling of the pre-Oswald assassination case. And I want to be clear, there is no statement in there which says the FBI could have prevented Oswald, or in any way that these deficiencies would have prevented Oswald from assassinating the President.

But the fact that the FBI was criticizing its own internal handling of the case, one of the major criticisms was that it did not intensify its investigation, after knowing that Oswald repeatedly lied to the agents, and after his Mexico City

contacts, that there were four or five month periods when nothing was done, when communications were mishandled, and you get a basic, really a basic intelligence failure within the FBI itself.

You then have Director Hoover knowing this, representing to the Warren Commission the FBI handled the case as it would any other case, never mentioning to anyone -- 17 agents, including an assistant director, were censured, put on probation or demoted, and with this motivation, he never told the Warren Commission that there was anything that the FBI did wrong.

I think one of the things we have to do is put ourselves back into that time period, and not for the sake of criticizing the Warren Commission, but for the sake of what the perspective then was of the FBI and the CIA. I think no one at that time would have believed that the FBI would have done anything wrong.

Senator Tower. In other words, the thrust of your criticism lies against the Agency and the Bureau and not the Warren Commission itself.

Senator Schweiker. Exactly.

Mr. Wallach. Exactly, how they performed. And I think in reading the report, I think one of the first things you will see, of Mr. Hoover, it was a negative investigation, in a sense. It was an investigation to prove Oswald guilty. I think the documents in a sense show that.

I don't want to say that there were not hundreds of agents

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

77

12

13

14

1.5

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in the field who were doing their dammedest to try to solve this case. They were just not provided with information that would have led them to solve it.

I don't know if there is a solution or whether we can still find it.

Senator Hart of Colorado. That is a very critical point, also, because we have got to be careful in anything we write. It is not just separating the agencies from the Commission. It is separating the leadership of the agencies from their rank and file.

As Jim and Paul both have testified, we go through here and fault the CIA and the FBI. I think we have got to refine that. We have got to say the leadership of the CIA and the FBI. There was obviously a conscious effort, as the staff has testified, by the leadership of both agencies, to prevent those assigned, to provide investigative capability to the Commission, from knowing what had been going on.

So you cannot even fault the whole agency because I think as Paul has just said about the FBI agents, I think the CIA people in charge of the investigation and the FBI people in charge of the investigation really tried to do their damnedest

Senator Schweiker. Tried to do their best.

Senator Hart of Colorado. But the leadership of both of those agencies, in Hoover's case he was more concerned about his reputation, and therefore information was withheld, and it

וו

was as Paul says negative investigation.

In the CIA's case, I think they were trying to cover their you know what by not revealing to their own investigators that they had been trying to kill Castro.

Senator Mondale. Could I ask a question, if questions are in order about this? This last FBI file that we found, now, we asked in a broad request the Bureau and the CIA to give us all documentations and files relating to assassinations, and those requests went forward some 15 months ago. And then as I understand it about a month ago as a result of our review of many of those files, we came to the conclusion that there had to be other files undelivered and undisclosed at the Bureau. And we found out that there were.

We have now seen some of those files, but we are not sure we have seen them all, is that correct?

Mr. Wallach. I believe that is a fair statement, Senator.

Senator Mondale. And it was in those files that we have seen that we found out for the first time that there was this sort of ad hoc, temporary interagency committee which was convened following Castro's threat to determine whether there was in fact a threat against American leaders, is that right?

Mr. Epstein. I think that was in a Department of Justice file. What we discovered in the FBI files that this Committee had not received before was the fact that in 1954 the Bureau learned of the CIA's assassination operation against Castro that

ĺ

involved AMLASH, and learned that the Agency's operation had been compromised.

Senator Mondale. So that file showed for the first time that the Bureau knew about both AMLASH and the Mafia.

Mr. Wallach. We know about that they knew about the Maria from the May 10th --

Senator Mondale. But they also knew about AMLASH.

we requested those files, there was a problem of trying to get the documents. Jim and I were sitting at the FBI, they brought in the file on AMLASH. They left out two critical documents. By reviewing the serials we saw that two were missing. They just happened to be the two documents which established that they had knowledge of AMLASH. I think the critical fact is not only did they have knowledge of AMLASH, but they got that knowledge from a Cuban source in the Cuban community down in Florida, and as one FBI agent said, when one Cuban knows some things, it is not a secret. They knew that that most secret operation was compromised, and they never told the CIA.

Senator Schweiker. In fact, we have a memo of the FBI saying don't tell the CIA that their operation was compromised.

I mean, this is so typical of what you find through that whole investigation, they wouldn't even tell the CIA their agent was flawed, and they kept that a secret from the CIA.

Senator Mondale. What I am trying to get at is, first of

21.

all, do we have all the files now?

Mr. Epstein. No.

Senator Hart of Colorado. No.

Senator Mondale. And secondly, is there reason to believe that they were deliberately withholding these files, because I think that is a very serious thing if true.

Mr. Wallach. Well, I don't know if the Committee has seen it, but we got a letter yesterday from the Justice Department liaison with the Committee which essentially adopts what the FBI said. As I remember -- do you want to speak to what the letter said, Mike?

Mr. Epstein. Yes. We wrote to the Attorney General and he supplied us with what he had been informed by the FBI, and what he said was the FBI tells me that they don't have a topical index which would have permitted them to locate these materials, captioned "Assassination Efforts Involving Castro," and that that is why those files weren't located back last year when this Committee asked for all of the files.

What we also didn't get, which came here just a few days ago -- and this wasn't provided a year ago either -- were materiash reflecting that the FBI was deeply involved in this Government's policy with respect to Cuba, following the Bay of Pigs.

Mr. Wallach. They met with Lansdale, and in fact, on one occasion, Belmont, who was second or third in charge of the

l

11.

FBI, jokingly suggested to Lansdale that they use the Maria to get rid of Castro, and we had no idea at that point that the FBI was involved at those early stages, 1961, with what was going on vis-a-vis Cuba and in fact, Hoover made some recommendations as to, you know, what should be done. It want to be clear, he didn't say go out and assassinate Castro.

Senator Mondale. I am not getting at what is in those files. I want to -- I am trying to get at was there an effort not to see those files?

Mr. Epstein. We have not examined that questioned. We have our complaint to the Attorney General, their response giving their reasons for why they didn't provide those files last year.

Senator Schweiker. That is sort of a tough one, Fritz. I don't know.

Senator Mondale. Now, the so-called interagency committee, set up after Castro's threat, am I not correct, we just found out about that?

Mr. Johnston. Senator, we knew that there was such an interagency committee. As a matter of fact, it was a successor to MONGOOSE, and it is detailed in our assassination report and its activities through June of '63. What we did not know was that the dommittee had met in September of 1963 to consider retaliation.

Senator Mondale. In other words, the point is that prior

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to Kennedy's assassination, an interagency task force had been assembled to discuss the fear, based on Castro's threat, that in fact our top leaders in this country might have their lives exposed to assassination because of what we were doing, and despite that, the Warren Commission was never told of any relationship between the assassination and -- when did we find out about that discussion?

Mr. Epsteih. About two weeks ago. Senator Mondale. All right.

And is not true that some of the people that worked with this Committee representing the agencies were on that committee? Senator Hart of Colorado. List the members.

Senator Schweiker. No, we don't know that now, do we? Senator Hart of Colorado. Just list the members.

Mr. Johnston. The members, Mr. Crimens of the State Department was coordinator of that, Mr. Califano was known to be, or we have evidence that he was the Defense Department representative. General Haig, at that time Lt. Colonel Haig, worked with Mr. Califano. We have indications that Mr. Fitzgerald was the CIA representative. I called Seymour Bolten at CIA and said our concern about that, and Seymour told me that Fitzgerald indeed was the CIA representative, but that even he, Seymour Bolten, had attended meetings of the interagency committee when Mr. Fitzgerald couldn't attend. In other words, there could have been other people from CIA.

2

4

.5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Senator Schweiker. Did he attend the specific meetings?

Mr. Johnston. We have no evidence that he attended. We have no evidence of who attended.

Senator Schweiker. If there is any evidence that he attended those meetings, he is in a very precarious position in regards to what he's told this Committee in recent months.

Senator Hart of Colorado. I think that is the point that you are getting at. There is a pattern, a perceptible pattern that information has been withheld on this Committee on a matter that we specifically indicated that we wanted to know about.

The only flaw in your formulation was the phrase "based upon Castro's threats." We only have the circumstances that the Committee met within 48 hours, and that is circumstantial.

Senator Mondale. I think it is fair to say, Dan, that there is a feeling here that some of these pending requests are being stalled out in the hope that this Committee will expire.

Senator Tower. At this point can I yield to Senator Inouye, because I think he wanted to ask some questions.

Senator Inouye. Just one.

You indicated that the Commission, the Warren Commission, was not really aware of the scope of the intelligence activities of the United States. Mr. Dulles was a member, wasn't he?

Mr. Johnston. Yes, sir.

Senator Inouve. . Was he aware of these assassination plans

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

or plots?

Mr. Johnston. What it seems to be is this. Mr. Dulles was replaced in November of 1961 by Mr. McCone. But Mr. Dulles indeed, when that replacement occurred. President Kennedy desired a shake-up of the CIA, and other organizational changes were made so that Mr. Dulles' knowledge would have been complete knowledge as of November 1961. He probably knew about the Mafia plots. Whether he knew about the evolution through MONGOOSE and on to the AMLASH plots is less certain. We have no evidence that he knew about the AMLASH plot, and on this point, Mr. Angleton, who was then head of the CIA counterintelli gence, told us that he met with Dulles frequently, in fact, met with Dulles frequently during the course of the Warren Commission and they would bounce ideas back and forth.

It is important to note that Mr. Angleton said that he did not know of the AMLASH operation, and that indeed he was compartmented out of most Cuban operations, although he had a general knowledge of it. He did not have the detailed knowledge of Cuban operations that other people did.

So we, at least the evidence looks like that Dulles would have known about the Mafia plots, but we have no evidence that he ever could have learned about the later operations.

Senator Inouye. Are you satisfied that he knew about them?

I think the Committee's report on Mr. Johnston.

2

.5

4

5

6

7

10

77

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

assassinations concluded that he probably did know.

Senator Inouye. Is there any evidence to show that he discussed this matter with his fellow commissioners?

Senator Mart of Colorado. Let that yield to me. Bill Miller has something on that matter.

Mr. Miller. When Senator Cooper was here last week, I asked him on behalf of this inquiry whether the Warren Commission members were in any way informed, either privately by Mr. Dulles or Mr. Helms or by any other member, by Hoover or the Deputies, of any of the assassination attempts with regards to Cuba, and he said no. The issue was not raised in any way, shape or form.

Senator Schweiker. In addition, our report does say that four of the counsel say exactly the same thing, Mr. Belin, and Mr. Griffin --

Mr. Johnston. Mr. Rankin.

Senator Schweiker. Four of the leading counsel make exactly the same representation.

Senator Huddleston. On that point, has there been any effort to research the Commission's report, not only the final report itself, but the backup information that they released, just to make sure that we are not making a claim relating to some evidence that is new that was not presented to the Commission.

Senator Hart of Colorado. Here is the only thing the final report contains on any Cuban connections, and you can see

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

how big it is, and these are portions of pages. It is about eight or ten pages.

Mr. Miller. Senator Cooper did expand on one point. He said that the interest of the Commission members was on 'determining who killed John Kennedy. That was the focus.

Senator Hart of Colorado. Not why.

Mr. Miller. Why insofar as they were able to determine, but he said it was their view, and they feel there is nothing that they have seen during their inquiry that would make them believe otherwise, that it was Oswald, and that it was the circumstances of the assassination, and Oswald himself they focused on and his motivations and so on.

I think he was disturbed by the lack of any knowledge at that time about any other connection with Cuba, but it was from his remarks, it was clearly not a part of their discussions.

Senator Tower. Let me repair to Senator Schweiker's proposal that there be immediate publication of this report to assist the successor Committee, and just ask Senator Incuye if he has any comment on that proposal.

Senator Inouye. I have been thinking about it, but I don't think I am in a position to make any contribution.

Senator Schweiker. I think, Danny, this will give you freedom to do anything that you want.

Senator Inouye. From the standpoint of relieving the Committee of any pressures, that is true, and eventually, whether

2

3

4

5

6

. 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you release it or not, I would suppose bit by bit it will be released.

Senator Schweiker. That is the problem.

Sanator Inouye. So that being the case, from my standpoint, it is just as well.

Senator Tower. In other words, you would approve Senator Schweiker's proposal.

Senator Mathias. Would you yield for a question? In its present form, is it sanitized as to methods? Senator Schweiker. No, we want the right -- and this is why I put in my motion that Senator Hart and I could work out with the staff complete sanitization with the FBI and the CIA, that would just, you know, we would just do as a matter of 🕟 course.

So we want to make it very clear there is no reason not to do that.

Senator Tower. So what you could do is publish a sanitized report and such matters as cannot be sanitized would be turned over to the Committee.

Senator Schweiker. Exactly,

Senator Tower. Does that procedure accord with your desires?

Senator Induye. Fine.

Senator Schweiker. And there is one other thing that we could do that might be healthy, and maybe in refuting, if

we 1	nave	a me	mora	ındum,	and	ti	Je.	issv	æ it,	you	know,	they	, wịâu.
give	e ជន់	anot	her	memora	ındu	m t	:hat	we	have	been	unabl.	e to	shake
ther	n 100	ose o	n, ä	end so	We	wot	alā	ivgo	ously.	ing	lude t	heir	side
of t	tha s	story	i ž	there	is	a s	side	tha	it the	ey har	ve bee	n hol	.ding
back	ζ.						,						

Senator Hart of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I want to persist in my view that this should be a full Committee report, and not a Hart-Schweiker report.

Senator Schweiker. I support that.

Senator Hart of Colorado. So I think we have got to buy all of you a grace period here of what, a week or whatever you need to read this thing and sign off on it, but I don't want it to be a two-member report.

Senator Schweiker. All of the other reports have been a Committee report, and I think that is a valid request.

Senator Inouye. Let me ask another question.

Senator Tower. Senator Inouye.

Senator Inouye. Are you satisfied that the only reason for the coverup conspiracy on the part of the top leadership of the FBI and the CIA was simple face-saving?

Senator Schweiker. No.

Mr. Johnston. No, Senator, I am not satisfied that that would be the conclusion, and I would like to touch on the fact that first of all there is open the possibility that higher authority in the government, at least when knowledgeable of the

general parameters of the problem, and approved the CIA's conduct in this regard. We have attempted to detail every meeting between the President, President Johnson and Director McCone in the relevant time period, November-December 1963. There is no evidence that the AMLASH operation was detailed to President Johnson. There is evidence that the President was told fully about the general thrust of the covert operations against Cuba, and apparently told that this included some coupplans.

It would be very important to find out precisely what he was told about that, as for example, if he were told only that there were coup planning in the works, that's one thing. If he were told that the coup plan had reached the stage that Desmond Fitzgerald had met with this agent and assured him that the assassination coup had U.S. support, that would be another matter.

I don't think it is solely limited at this point to a coverup by Agency officials, high level Agency officials.

I think the other option has to be kept open.

Senator Schweiker. This is something, Dan, you may or may not want to pursue. That is one of your options.

Senator Tower. Since it is a suggestion of Senator Hart, do I understand that Senator Hart and Senator Schweiker both agree that the question should be put over until all of the other Committee members have an opportunity to read the report?

Senator Hart of Colorado. Or in the alternative, that
we vote, that we reaffirm our vote two weeks ago or three
weeks ago to release, but making pending seven to ten days
period for every member to read and sign on the report or
something like that. Therefore, when the period ends, we will
release it.

Senator Tower. Do you want to couch that in the form of a motion?

Senator Schweiker. Well, we have a technical problem.
We have to have a vote prior to the end of this month on it.

Senator Mathias. Well may I make a suggestion? Can we make the vote conditional on whether or not a majority of the members have registered an objection prior to Midnight on the 31st?

Can we do something of that sort?

Senator Hart of Colorado. Yes, we have got a little technical but a very important problem for the gentlemen sitting neatly in front of you, and that is that their salaries are going to end one of these days, and we can't expect these people to work pro bono.

Senator Schweiker. I was willing to subsume some of that burden, but I wonder if it wouldn't be more tidy, if Danny would be recpective to, for several weeks, to just put them on the temporary basis, because you have got classified material I can't handle that, hobody can in their office, until that

l

2

3

4.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

project terminates:

Senator Inouge. I can assure you that is under very serious consideration. The only reason we have not acted is very simple. The majority side has met to organize, the minority side has not yet, and although I am Chairman of the Committee, I don't wish to take any step until the full Committee has been organized.

Senator Schweiker. Well, I will be glad to go along with what you say, Danny. It would be strictly until the basis of this project is completed, so you are in no way -- we are not delineating your new staff.

Senator Inouye. What do you mean when the project is completed?

Senator Tower. Well, you see, we go out of business on the 31st, and to tidy up this matter. I think what Senator Schweiker is suggesting is some of the staff of this Committee could be continued on a temporary basis on your Committee until the report is published, and then you can hire your own.

Senator Schweiker. See, we have to go back to the CIA and the FBI in the next day or so.

Senator Tower. You are going to have to -- it is going to take you a while to hire your own people, anyway.

Senator Inouye. I have already asked for the names of the members.

Senator Tower. Would you like to restate your motion again

Mac?

٦

2

3

6

7

8

9

7.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Senator Mathias. My motion would be that the work be published as a full Committee report, unless a majority of the members of the Committee would register an objection prior to midnight on May 31st.

Senator Tower. Do you want to take that a step further, in which case the matter would be turned over to the successor Committee?

Senator Mathias. I think we would have no option, in which case it would be turned over.

Senator Hart of Colorado. What day is the 31st?

Senator Mathias. It is Monday and nobody will be here.

I would suggest we have a meeting.

Senator Hart of Colorado. So you all have, in effect, until

Senator Schweiker. Why don't you make it Friday night?

Senator Mathias. I would be glad to accept that. That

gives us three days.

Senator Hart of Colorado. It is a two hour reading job. Senator Schweiker. Say that again?

Senator Mathias. That the report be published as a full Committee report, subject to being sanitized and so forth, unless a majority of the members of the Committee register objection by 5:00 o'clock on Friday, May 28th.

Senator Huddleston. Let's establish how and where we register

4.1

1	an objection.
2	Senator Tower. With Mr. Milker.
3	Senator Mondale. Can we take this thing with us?
4	Senator Hart of Colorado. No, no.
5	Senator Tower. You have heard the motion.
6	Mr. Miller, would you call the roll?
7	Mr. Miller. Mr. Hart of Michigan.
8	Senator Hart of Michigan. Aye.
9	Mr. Miller. Mr. Mondale.
10	Senator Mondale. Aye.
11	Mr. Miller. Mr. Huddleston.
12	Senator Huddleston. Aye.
13	Mr. Miller. Mr. Morgan.
14	Senator Huddleston. Aye by proxy.
15	Mr. Miller. Mr. Hart of Colorado.
16	Senator Hart of Colorado. Aye.
17	Mr. Miller. Mr. Baker.
18	Senator Tower. Mr. Baker is absent. I have no instruction
19	Mr. Miller. Mr. Goldwater.
20	Senator Tower. No.
21	Mr. Miller. Mr. Mathias.
. 22	Senator Mathias. Aye.
23	Mr. Miller. Mr. Schweiker.
24	Senator Schweiker. Aye.
25	Mr. Miller. Mr. Church.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

77

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

79

20

21

22

23

24

25

Не	told	me	on	the	phone	that	he	was	for	this.
	•			•	1 40 1 1					

Senator Tower. Ask Phil to exercise his proxy.

Senator Hart of Michigan. By proxy, aye.

Mr. Miller. Mr. Tower.

-Senator Tower.

Mr. Miller. The motion carries.

Senator Schweiker. What is the vote on it?

Mr. Miller. It is eight to two with one to be determined.

Senator Tower. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Baker

be polled.

If there is no objection, that will be done.

Now we move on to consideration of turn-over of Committee

Mr. Miller?

files and other transition matters.

Senator Hart of Colorado. John, maybe I am out of order.

Senator Tower. I recognize the Senator from Colorado.

out of order.

Senator Hart of Colorado. In case we are asked the grounds for dissension, do we know it or not?

Senator Tower. I think that is incumbent upon those who dissented.

Senator Hart of Colorado. I just refer it.

Senator Tower. Mr. Miller.

Mr. Miller. The Committee staff has put the files in order for turn-over to the successor Committee. We have returned to

the	Agencie	s all the	materials	that have	been on a	loan basis
and	I think	our acco	unt is cle	ear in this	respect.	.What is
left	in the	files af	ter removi	ing/ return	ing and de	stroying
are	45 file	cases of	four draw	vers each o	f material	that we
thi	ak might	be of us	e to a suc	ccessor com	mittee.	

The problem this poses for the successor committee is that because of the mass of material, there has to be some means of communicating what is inside the files to the new committee. It would be my recommendation that for a transitional period, that the research group, that it be recommended that the research group be taken on by the oversight committee for a period of transition so that they can make a decision whether they want to retain all or any of the material that the Select Committee has acquired in its 13 months of existence.

Senator Huddleston. And there is a matter of security to continue, too.

Mr. Miller. The security situation is, I think the most secure place for it at the moment is to remain in the auditorium with, ideally with Mr. Marshall or some equivalent.

Senator Tower. What you suggest is that this committee immediately retain the security force that we now have.

Mr. Miller. Certainly on a transitional basis.

Senator Tower. Certainly on a transitional basis, and they will probably use them anyway.

Senator Inouye. We are already in the midst of discussions

with Miller	I.	tried	to ge	t ahold	of Frank,	but he	was busy
elsewhere.	And	I this	ik we	will be	retaining	your ma	n in charge
of security.		•					

We are looking over for Committee space. We have got this space now, but 45 cabinets takes a lot of room. We are preparing a letter to the Rules Committee requesting that we serve as your successor, not only for space, but for everything else, the equipment and the works. And at the appropriate time, if we don't want it, we will just throw it away.

At this moment we are just putting a big hand on it.

Senator Tower. I don't think this requires any formal action by this Committee. I think we all agree that the transition will be made, that all the remaining materials in our files will be turned over to them, subject to their making a determination of what they want.

And them I would suppose it could be worked out with the staff.

Senator Inouye. The only problem we have on personnel action --

Senator Tower. You more or less have to leave it where it is, as I understand, because of the stress factor.

Mr. Kirbow. If they try to put you in one of the old buildings, Mr. Chairman, they are not stressed to hold anything more --

Senator Inouye. The only other place we could find would

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1.4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I DF SECRE

be the tunnel near our subway tunnel.

But in the transition, we intend, at least I am going to recommend, that we retain some of the personnel you have here for purposes of transition, but this is a bad time, if you know what I mean. We are right on the eve of a recess, and the troops are going to scatter, and so I hope that those we will be selecting, they will be notified, but they may find themselves with a one-week hiatus or something like that.

They may have to survive on beans for a week or something.

Senator Tower. Bill, is there anything that requires formal action by the Committee?

Senator Inouye. May I request that your Committee submit to us at the earliest the list of those who you feel should be in this transition team?

Senator Tower. The staff is so directed.

Is there any further question?

Senator Huddleston. By about 2:30 this afternoon.

Senator Tower. Is there any further question or any further pending business?

Senator Mathias. Well, John, there is one other question about which I feel some responsibility.

I made a motion that the gross expenditure for intelligence purposes should not be divulged in the Committee report, and that that question should be referred for decision to the full Senate. No action has been taken by the full Senate on that

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

74

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25.

and I feel some responsibility for raising the question in the Senate. I prefer to raise it here first to see what the other members, and advice of counsel, is.

Senator Hart of Michigan. Mr. Chairman?

Senator Tower. Senator Hart?

Senator Hart of Michigan. I am glad Senator Mathias reminded me, because it was decided by a margin of one vote, and I supported his motion. I did it then in the belief that it would be one of the easiest clubs to be used by those who did not want the creation of a permanent committee, to clobber us with. I did it also in the belief that when it was presented to the Senaté, that it probably would then be disclosed.

I share Senator Mathias's concern that somehow or other we get the issue before the Senate.

Senator Tower. I am sure it will get there.

Senator Hart of Michigan. Well, it has not yet.

Senator Tower. I think it is almost inevitable that it will.

Senator Mathias. I don't know whether it takes a resolution here, or requesting the Majority Leader to schedule it, and that is about the only thing that we can do.

Senator Huddleston. Any member can make a motion on the floor.

Senator Hart of Michigan. Well, Senator Mathias would be the logical one, having made the motion here.

'9

1,3

Senator Inouye.

Senator Mathias. I am prepared to do that, and I would
be glad to have the concurrence of the Senator from Michigan.
Senator Hart of Michigan. You do.
Senator Mathias. Well, why don't we get together and plan
to do that.
Senator Inouve. Are you satisfied that you have made
this motion that it is from now to eternity and nobody will
ever know how much the gross figure is?
Senator Mathias. If we make the motion, they will know.
will publish it.
Senator Inouye. What, you want to publish it?
Senator Mathias. We want to publish it now.
Senator Inouye. I thought everyone wanted to keep it
secret.
Senator Tower. Gentlemen, is there anything further?
Senator Schweiker. I just have a minor point.
Danny, did I understand on the technical thing on the
staff that while there may be a week's gap, which I can
understand, would there possibly be a retroactivity to the
first of June when it is set up?
Senator Inouye. Oh, yes.
Senator Schweiker. No problem.

Mr. Wallach. Just before we conclude, I guess on behalf

They might have a week of ulcers, that's

1.4

of the staff I would like to thank both Senators Hart and
Schweiker for the amount of time that they have put into this
and I think it is I don't know if the Committee realizes
really the amount of time that they personally have put into
attending sessions and reviewing documents and things like
that. And on behalf of the staff, the cooperation they have
given us, and I just want to express thanks very much.

Senator Tower. Well, thank you very much, and I want to say on behalf of the Committee that we all of us express to Senators Hart and Schweiker our appreciation for the hard work they have done on this. Having served on the drafting committee last summer, I know how time consuming this can be in the hands of two people or three.

So I think that the Committee would like to express their thanks to Senators Hart and Schweiker.

Senator Hart of Colorado. Well, thank you.

I think it is the other way around in terms of the staff and us. I think we owe it to the five people that you see here.

Senator Schweiker. They have been a very dedicated staff.

Senator Hart of Colorado. We have got the very same problem we had a couple of weeks ago. I am told there are reporters outside. I am not going to go talk to them because all we have got to say is the same thing we have said two or three weeks ago.

Senator Tower. I will go shead and talk to them and tell.

them the action we took.

Is there anything else?

Then I declare that this Committee is adjourned, sine die.

(Whereupon, at 11:57 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned,

sime die.)